

* The original of this document contains information which is subject to withholding from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552. Such material has been deleted from this copy and replaced with XXXXXX's.

April 8, 2005

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

Name of Case: Worker Appeal

Date of Filing: October 29, 2004

Case No.: TIA-0298

XXXXXXXXXXXX (the Applicant) applied to the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Worker Advocacy (OWA) for DOE assistance in filing for state workers' compensation. The OWA referred the application to an independent Physician Panel (the Panel), which determined that the Applicant's illness was not related to his work at the DOE. The OWA accepted the Panel's determination, and the Applicant filed an Appeal with the DOE's Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA), challenging the Panel's determination. As explained below, we have concluded that the Appeal should be dismissed as moot.

I. Background

A. The Relevant Statute and Regulations

The Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 as amended (the Act) concerns workers involved in various ways with the nation's atomic weapons program. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 7384, 7385. As originally enacted, the Act provided for two programs. Subpart B established a Department of Labor (DOL) program providing federal compensation for certain illnesses. See 20 C.F.R. Part 30. Subpart D established a DOE assistance program for DOE contractor employees filing for state workers' compensation benefits. Under the DOE program, an independent physician panel assessed whether a claimed illness or death arose out of and in the course of the worker's employment, and exposure to a toxic substance, at a DOE facility. 42 U.S.C. § 7385o(d)(3); 10 C.F.R. Part 852 (the Physician Panel Rule). The OWA was responsible for this program.

The Physician Panel Rule provided for an appeal process. An applicant could appeal a decision by the OWA not to submit an application to a Physician Panel, a negative determination by a Physician Panel that was accepted by the OWA, and a final decision by the OWA not to accept a Physician Panel determination in favor of an applicant. The instant appeal was filed pursuant to that Section. The Applicant sought review of a negative determination by a Physician Panel that was accepted by the OWA. 10 C.F.R. § 852.18 (a) (2).

While the Applicant's appeal was pending, Congress repealed Subpart D. Ronald W. Reagan Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, Pub. L. No. 108-375 (October 28, 2004) (the Authorization Act). Congress added a new subpart to the Act, Subpart E, which establishes a DOL workers' compensation program for DOE contractor employees. Under Subpart E, all Subpart D claims will be considered as Subpart E claims. *Id.* § 3681(g). In addition, under Subpart E, an applicant is deemed to have an illness related to a workplace toxic exposure at DOE if the applicant received a positive determination under Subpart B. *Id.* § 3675(a).

B. Procedural Background

The Applicant was employed as a maintenance supervisor and materials dispatcher at the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant (the plant). He worked at the plant for approximately 25 years, from 1967 to 1992.

The Applicant filed an application with the OWA, requesting physician panel review of his multiple myeloma. The Physician Panel rendered a negative determination, which the OWA accepted. The Panel found no reasonable medical evidence to relate the disease to a toxic chemical or radiological exposure. See Physician's Panel Report. Subsequently, the Applicant filed the instant appeal.

In his appeal, the Applicant argues that the Panel erred when it concluded that his illness was not related to his employment at the plant. The Applicant states that there have been many studies that have determined a link between low level, long term exposure to radiation and multiple myeloma. The Applicant also indicates that he received a positive DOL Subpart B determination. See Applicant's Appeal Letter.

II. Analysis

Under the Physician Panel Rule, independent physicians rendered an opinion whether a claimed illness was related to exposure to toxic substances during employment at a DOE facility. The Rule required that the Panel address each claimed illness, make a finding whether that illness was related to toxic exposure at the DOE site, and state the basis for that finding. 10 C.F.R. § 852.12.

A positive DOL Subpart B determination was received. A positive DOL Subpart B determination satisfies the Subpart E requirement that the illness be related to a toxic exposure during employment at DOE. Authorization Act § 3675(a). See also *Worker Appeal*, Case No. TIA-0228, 29 DOE ¶ 80,202 (2005). Accordingly, Subpart E has rendered moot the physician panel determination and consideration of any challenge to the Panel report is not necessary.

As the foregoing indicates, the appeal should be dismissed as moot. In compliance with Subpart E, the claim will be transferred to the DOL for review. The DOL is in the process of developing procedures for evaluating and issuing decisions on these claims. OHA's dismissal of this claim does not purport to dispose of or in any way prejudice the DOL's review of the claim under Subpart E.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The Appeal filed in Worker Advocacy, Case No. TIA-0298, be, and hereby is, dismissed.
- (2) This dismissal pertains only to the DOE claim and not to the DOL's review of this claim under Subpart E.
- (3) This is a final order of the Department of Energy.

George B. Breznay
Director
Office of Hearings and Appeals

Date: April 8, 2005